

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-49 have been canceled, and claims 50-70 have been newly added by amendment. No new matter has been added.

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) as not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. The Applicant respectfully asserts that the objections to drawings are moot in view of the amendments.

Claims 2-5 and 17-23 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Applicant respectfully asserts that the 112, second paragraph rejections are moot in view of the amendments.

Claims 18, 20-23, and 42 are rejected under 35 USC 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Applicant respectfully asserts that the 101 rejections are moot in view of the amendments.

Claims 1, 2-5, 17, and 27-41 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by Robinson, and claims 18-23 and 43-49 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Robinson in view of ReceiptCity. In view of the Remarks and amendments, the Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and requests allowance of the pending claims.

**Independent Claim 50**

Claim 50 recites a method for generating electronic receipts, and includes the step of using the receipt generator to generate a first sales receipt object that comprises first transaction information from a first sales transaction and one or more functions for the first transaction information.

On page 5, the Office Action states:

The word “object” has both software and graphical connotations.  
It can also mean a variable comprising both routines and data.  
What explicitly are you considering an electronic receipt object?

The Applicant would like to clarify what is meant by “object.” Specifically, the object of claim 50 comprises information (data) and one or more functions for that information (routines).

The Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 50 is allowable for at least the reason that neither Robinson nor ReceiptCity disclose a receipt generator generating a first sales receipt object as recited in claim 50.

Claim 50 is also allowable for at least the reason that neither Robinson nor ReceiptCity disclose executing a store function of the first sales receipt object to add information to the first sales receipt object, as recited in claim 50.

Claim 50 is also allowable for at least the reason that Robinson at column 8, lines 45-57 does not disclose executing a retrieve function of the first sales receipt object to retrieve selected transaction information from the first sales receipt object, as recited in claim 50.

Robinson at column 8, lines 45-57 discloses:

In steps 144 and 146, the transaction record is decrypted by the merchant computer and the transaction information is extracted. Note that, of course, the method of decryption will depend on the method used for encryption in step 115 of FIG. 1. Since the transaction record was originally encrypted under the direction of the merchant, the merchant computer simply uses the same private key to extract the transaction data. In the case where digital signature techniques are used, the validity of the digital signature may be verified in the following manner. First, the signature is decrypted to extract the signature data. The signature data may then be compared with data obtained by applying the predetermined hash function to the appended confirmation message.

As seen above, the cited language discloses a transaction record being decrypted by a merchant computer and the transaction information being extracted. In contrast, claim 50 recites a sales receipt object comprising transaction information and one or more functions for the transaction information. Accordingly, claim 50 is allowable for at least the reason that the cited language does not disclose executing a retrieve function of the first sales receipt object to retrieve selected transaction information from the first sales receipt object, as recited in claim 50. By extension, claim 50 is also allowable for at least the reason that Robinson does not disclose displaying the selected retrieved transaction information on a user interface of the computing device, as recited in claim 50.

The Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 50 is also allowable for at least the reason that Robinson at column 8, lines 6-11 does not disclose executing a conversion function of the first sales receipt object to convert the first transaction information into a selected data format, as recited in claim 50. As discussed above, Robinson discloses encrypting a transaction record, which does not disclose executing a conversion function of the first sales receipt object to convert the first transaction information into a selected data format, as recited in claim 50.

**Dependent Claims 51-59**

Claims 51-59 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends directly or indirectly from allowable claim 50.

**Independent Claim 60**

Claim 60 recites a method for generating electronic receipts, and includes the step of using the receipt generator to generate a first sales receipt object that comprises first transaction information from a first sales transaction and one or more functions for the first transaction information. As discussed above, Robinson does not disclose using a receipt generator to generate a sale receipt object as defined by the Applicant. Accordingly, claim 60 is allowable for at least the reason that Robinson does not disclose using the receipt generator to generate a first sales receipt object that comprises first transaction information from a first sales transaction and one or more functions for the first transaction information, as recited in claim 60.

Claim 60 is also allowable for at least the reason that Robinson does not disclose the steps of executing a retrieve function of the sales receipt object to retrieve selected transaction information from the sales receipt object, displaying the selected retrieved transaction information on a user interface of the computing device, or executing a conversion function of the sales receipt object to convert the transaction information into a selected data format, as recited in claim 60.

**Dependent Claims 61-70**

Claims 61-70 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends directly or indirectly from allowable claim 60.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in the Application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the application to issue. No additional fee is believed due. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 14-0629.

Respectfully submitted,

NEEDLE & ROSENBERG, P.C.

/Jason S. Jackson/

Jason S. Jackson  
Registration No. 56,733

NEEDLE & ROSENBERG, P.C.  
Customer Number 23859  
(678) 420-9300  
(678) 420-9301 (fax)